UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/808,102	03/13/2001	Bernard M. Ciongoli	T0478/7005 GSE	3116

7590 09/13/2004

Gary S. Engelson
WOLF, GREENFIELDS & SACKS, P.C.
Federal Reserve Plaza
600 Atlantic Avenue
Boston, MA 02210-2211

EXAMINER	
AKPATI, ODAICHE T	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2135	

DATE MAILED: 09/13/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/808,102	CIONGOLI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Tracey Akpati	2135	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on 13 March 2001 is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☒ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 005.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

New corrected drawings are required in this application because Fig. 1 and 2 are informal drawings. Applicant is advised to employ the services of a competent patent draftsperson outside the Office, as the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office no longer prepares new drawings. The corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The requirement for corrected drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 2, 3 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baker (6775657B1).

With respect to Claim 1, the limitation of "a private network gateway" is met on Fig. 1 and on column 4, lines 9-14. The host node can be a router and hence represent the private network gateway. Further limitation of "a circuit switch" is obvious over column 8, lines 5-10; and "the private network gateway connected in series with the circuit switch between the external communications network and the private network" is met by Fig. 1; and "the private network gateway including an intruder detector which produces an alarm output when intruder

activity is detected" is met on column 8, lines 17-31; and "the circuit switch selectively disconnecting the external communications network from the private network responsive to the alarm output of the intruder detector" on column 8 , lines 26-31. The intruder's connection is disconnected and reconnected with a "honeypot". A "honeypot" is a decoy server that is used to isolate and monitor an intruder. The intranet of Fig. 1 represents the private network while internet represents the external network. The network node represents the private network gateway (router).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a circuit switch in place of the connectionless-based protocol of Baker (column 8, lines 5-10) so as to perform the same functions of switching between alternate routes. One of such routes would be to redirect an intruder to the decoy (honeypot) server to allow for isolation and monitoring.

With respect to Claim 2, the limitation of "a decoy computer resource connected to the circuit switch; the circuit switch selectively connecting the private network gateway to the decoy computer resource responsive to the alarm output of the intruder detector" is met by Baker on column 8, lines 17-30.

With respect to Claim 3, Baker meets the limitation of "wherein the circuit switch transfers the connection of the private network gateway from the private network to the decoy computer resource in a time period not noticeable to a human user" on column 8, lines 17-31. It is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art for the time period not to be noticeable to a human

user so that intruder would not know that he is being decoyed to another server. If the time period was noticeable to a human user then the intruder would know that he was being decoyed to a 'safe' server and disconnect from the network.

With respect to Claim 13, the limitation of "detecting an intruder to the private network from the external communications network; and generating an alarm signal responsive to the step of detecting; and reconnecting the intruder from the private network to a decoy resource in a time period not noticeable to the intruder" is met by Baker on column 8, lines 17-31. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to redirect the intruder in a time period not noticeable by the intruder so as to prevent the intruder from knowing he is being monitored. If the intruder can detect that he is being redirected to a decoy server, this defeats the purpose of decoy server within the private network. The intruder would disconnect himself from the network and hence prevent himself from being monitored.

Claims 8-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baker (6775657B1) in view of Huff et al (6408391 B1).

With respect to Claim 8, all the limitation is met by Baker except for the following limitation.

The limitation of "wherein the circuit switch connects a digital input signal to a digital output signal through a digital circuit switch matrix" is met by Huff et al on column 6, lines 53-58.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Huff et al within the system of Baker because a switch allows for connection and disconnection of an external network from the private network.

With respect to Claim 9, all the limitation is met by Baker except for the following limitation.

The limitation of "wherein the circuit switch connects an input signal to an output signal through an analog circuit switch matrix" is met by Huff et al on Fig. 1 and on column 5, lines 48-51.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Huff et al within the system of Baker because a switch allows for connection and disconnection of an external network from the private network.

With respect to Claim 10, all the limitation is met by Baker except for the following limitation.

The limitation of "wherein the circuit switch connects an optical input signal to an optical output signal through an optical circuit switch matrix" is met by Huff et al on column 6, lines 63-67.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Huff et al within the system of Baker because a switch allows for connection and disconnection of an external network from the private network.

With respect to Claim 11, all the limitation is met by Baker except for the following limitation.

The limitation of "wherein the circuit switch is located on premises containing equipment of the external communications network" is met by Huff et al on Fig. 1.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Huff et al within the system of Baker because a switch allows for connection and disconnection of an external network from the private network.

With respect to Claim 12, all the limitation is met by Baker except for the following limitation.

The limitation of "wherein the circuit switch is located on premises containing equipment of the private network" is met by Huff et al on Fig. 1.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Huff et al within the system of Baker because a switch allows for connection and disconnection of an external network from the private network.

Claims 4-7, 14-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baker (6775657B1) in view of Huizinga et al (Disconnected Operation for Heterogeneous Servers).

With respect to Claim 4, all the limitation is met by Baker except for the following limitation.

The limitation of "wherein the time period is less than 100 mS" is met by Huizinga et al on page 314, second column, second paragraph and page 320, first column, second paragraph.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Huizinga et al within the system of Baker because a short redirection period prevents a noticeable break in communication transfer.

With respect to Claim 5, all the limitation is met by Baker except for the following limitation.

The limitation of "wherein the time period is less than 100 μS" is met by Huizinga on page 314, second column, second paragraph and on page 320, first column, second paragraph.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Huizinga et al within the system of Baker because a short redirection period prevents a noticeable break in communication transfer.

With respect to Claim 6, all the limitation is met by Baker except for the following limitation.

The limitation of "wherein the time period is less than 100 nS" is met by Huizinga on page 314, second column, second paragraph and on page 320, first column, second paragraph.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Huizinga et al within the system of Baker because a short redirection period prevents a noticeable break in communication transfer.

With respect to Claim 7, all the limitation is met by Baker except for the following limitation.

The limitation of "wherein the time period is about 90 nS" is met by Huizinga on page 314, second column, second paragraph and on page 320, first column, second paragraph.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Huizinga et al within the system of Baker because a short redirection period prevents a noticeable break in communication transfer.

With respect to Claim 14, all the limitation is met by Baker except for the following limitation.

The limitation of "wherein the time period is less than 100 mS" is met by Huizinga et al on page 314, second column, second paragraph and page 320, first column, second paragraph.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Huizinga et al within the system of Baker because a short redirection period prevents a noticeable break in communication transfer.

With respect to Claim 15, all the limitation is met by Baker except for the following limitation.

The limitation of "wherein the time period is less than 100 μS" is met by Huizinga on page 314, second column, second paragraph and on page 320, first column, second paragraph.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Huizinga et al within the system of Baker because a short redirection period prevents a noticeable break in communication transfer.

With respect to Claim 16, all the limitation is met by the system of Baker except for the following limitation.

The limitation of "wherein the time period is less than 100 nS" is met by Huizinga on page 314, second column, second paragraph and on page 320, first column, second paragraph.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Huizinga et al within the system of Baker because a short redirection period prevents a noticeable break in communication transfer.

With respect to Claim 17, all the limitation is met by the system of Baker except for the following limitation.

The limitation of "wherein the time period is about 90 nS" is met by Huizinga on page 314, second column, second paragraph and on page 320, first column, second paragraph.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Huizinga et al within the system of Baker because a short redirection period prevents a noticeable break in communication transfer.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tracey Akpati whose telephone number is 703-305-7820. The examiner can normally be reached on 8.30am-6.00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Vu can be reached on 703-305-4393. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

OTA

KIM VU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100